



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| | | | | |
|--|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
| 10/540,571 | 06/24/2005 | Naoe Sakurai | 272232US0PCT | 6457 |
| 22850 | 7590 | 07/13/2009 | EXAMINER | |
| OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. | | | NGUYEN, THIUY-AI N | |
| 1940 DUKE STREET | | | | |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1796 | |
| | | NOTIFICATION DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| | | 07/13/2009 | ELECTRONIC | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

| | | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Interview Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 10/540,571 | SAKURAI ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | THUY-AI N. NGUYEN | 1796 | |

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Marina I. Miller, Ph.D.

(3) David Wu.

(2) Thuy- Ai N. Nguyen.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 07 July 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-9.

Identification of prior art discussed: Tomarchio et al. (US. 2003/0019508) and Klisch et al. (US. 4,554,098).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant discussed whether the ratio is applied for the primary anionic surfactant and whether the substitution of glycine betaine for laurylaminocetate changes the property of the prior art. Applicant is suggested to show the critical point about the difference in the ratio between the claim and the prior art.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

| |
|--|
| /David Wu/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796 |
|--|